

Basis

> Data systems face obstacles in their contribution to science and applications:

- Heterogeneous sensors, platforms, projects, and campaigns
- Changing content, multiple formats, disparate projections, etc.
- Multiple means of searching, discovery, packaging and delivery of data

Standards enable data systems interoperability

- Standards can contribute to science success and interoperability within their discipline
- "Downstream" users have known, well documented path to use the data
- Operational benefit for a common set of protocols for discovery and interchange
- Engineering benefit to limiting the range of encoding (i.e., the number of different formats)

Insights

- > Interoperability does not require homogeneous systems, but rather coordination at the interfaces
- Discipline communities have wherewithal and the solutions
- > NASA is seeking community leadership



Background for Precipitation Standards

- ➤ NASA's Earth Science Data Systems Standards Process Group explored the possibility of identifying disciplines where metadata or content standards could have an impact
- > Small focus group of precipitation scientists were identified
 - George Huffman, Phil Arkin, John Bates, John Janowiak, Chris Kummerow, Jeff McCollum, and Joe Turk

> Initial discussion focused on

- Discussed feasibility of creating a content standard for precipitation data files
- Level-2 precipitation standards considered as a reasonable goal
- Standards must be extensible to allow for new parameters as innovations in algorithms improve the science
- Agreed that small number of mandatory metadata and data content parameters would be useful



Suggested additional optional metadata and data parameters to improve the usability

Strawman Level-2 Metadata Standards

Metadata Content

> Orbit Segment Standard

- Start date and time (yyyymmdd and hhmmssss)
- End date and time
- Number of scans in the orbit segment
- Platform (satellite) identifier
- Sensor name
- Processing algorithm and version
- Processing date
- Point of contact information
- Pointer to documentation

> Optional Parameters – permit but not require

- Orbit number of low-Earth orbit data (highly recommended)
- Number of leading scans duplicated from previous orbit segment
- Number of trailing scans duplicated from following orbit segment
- Calibration source data set and version number



Strawman Level-2 Data Content

Data Content

> Each Field of View Standard

- Latitude and longitude
- Date and time
- Surface precipitation estimate (mm/hr)
 - specify instantaneous or time averaged
- Precipitation quality estimate
 - e.g., RMS, bias, ambiguous flag...
- Sensor quality flag
- Geolocation quality flag
- Scan position index (or fractional orbit number)
- Cell (location) number within scan



Optional Level-2 Data Content

> Optional Parameters

- Precipitation type i.e., convective or stratiform
- Spacecraft position, velocity, and altitude at the start of the scan
- Surface flag (e.g., land, coast, or ocean)
- Fractional land coverage
- Additional precipitation variables (e.g., near-surface, vertical structure
- Precipitation quality estimates for any additional precipitation variables
- Additional geophysical variables
 - -e.g., total precipitable water, total precipitable ice, latent heat structure



Feedback

International Precipitation Working Group discussed the merits of precipitation content standards and concluded:

- > Supported the introduction of Level-2 precipitation content standards
 - specific recommendations (e.g., blank filling for missing lines, calibration source)
 - precipitation quality estimates but needs more rigorous definition
 - precipitation type
 - common documentation format encouraged
- Standards for Level-3 (blended precipitation over various space and time scales) is premature
- Recommended the formation of a working group under the auspices of the Global Precipitation Mission to further explore standards

